

UDC: 31.
LBC: 60.55
MJ № 186

LOVE AS A FATAL EMOTION

Dashdamir Mahmandarov*

Abstract. This article explores the notion that human behaviors and desires can be attributed to someone called the "Other." Throughout history, since Aristotle, it has been suggested that humans are imitative beings. Along with further developed versions of Aristotle's concept of mimesis, the idea emerged that man actually imitates the desire of the "Other". That is manifested not only in personal life, but also in all aspects of social life. In this article, the focus is specifically on love and how it can be understood through this theory. Contrary to contemporary interpretations of love, the argument is made that it is, in fact, a destructive (murderous) emotion. To support this claim, references to literature, psychoanalysis, literary criticism, and philosophy are made. It is claimed that love is not a feeling of happiness, but of crisis, hysterical fits and pain. Tolstoy's Anna Karenina serves as an example of love's tumultuous nature. The fact that people give different shades to this ancient feeling in the modern world parallels the change of the world and human understanding. In the modern world, people attempt to live a life free of pain, sterilized and unwounded which causes a change in the essence of love. The article emphasizes these features and describes the ancient essence of love.

Keywords: Love, Mimesis, Aristotle

1.Introduction

*Başkalarının aşkıyla başlıyor hayatımız
Yaprakla yağmurun aşkı mesela
Başkalarının aşkıyla başlıyor hayatımız
Bakıp başkasının başkayla kurduğu bağlantıya
Aşka dair diyoruz ilk anı bu olmalı.
İsmet Özel [Özel, 2004, s.14-16.]*

* Doctor of Philosophy in Sociology,
Teacher of department of "religious studies" of Theology Institute of Azerbaijan; Baku, Azerbaijan
E-mail: dasdemirmehmandarov@ait.edu.az
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9604-4766>

To cite this article: Mahmandarov, D. [2023]. Love as a fatal emotion. "Metafizika" journal, 6(4), pp.65-72.

Article history:
Received: 11.09.2023
Accepted: 01.12.2023

Human life is continually based on relationships with others. Socialization is precisely the process by which one becomes like others by watching them. That constitutes the basis of all human cultural activity in which people imitate, take others as examples, and complete the socialization process. By learning a language, he or she participates in social life and holds his own position in society. Language is the fundamental determinant of human life. Thanks to language, people learn to socialize and acculturate their natural impulses and love is one of them. Sexuality exists as a natural instinct in both animals and humans. However, only human sexuality can acquire a cultural dimension, which is called eroticism. Love, like eroticism, is a cultural conceptualization as well as a learned and imitated behavioral model.

The reason why love is learned is because humans are mimetic beings. Since all cultural behaviors are based on imitating others, they must also take the others into consideration in later times. Love and eroticism cannot exist without the entity and inclusiveness of language and mimeticism. As language and sexuality transforming into eroticism, love is also a cultural and learned emotional state.

On the other hand, the fatal side of love is incessantly denied in the modern period. That is because the Modern world is based on the assumption that humans are rational beings. People are not expected to act irrationally in any field. Anti-government movements and actions such as rebel groups and fatal love are abnegated by people and powers. Meanwhile, in the modern world, irrational emotions and behaviors are punished or covered up and excluded from society.

2.Mimesis, other and, fatal love

Human being is a creature that learns everything based on imitation. Aristotle distinguished man from other beings with this characteristic. A person is a being who can imitate and copy others in the way that he socializes with people, admires them and becomes one of them. He learns language, morality, life and death only from others as well as his emotions, reactions, and everything else he thinks he owns by imitating others what is called mimesis by Aristotle. Rene Girard later formulated a theory of mimetic desire under this name. He applies this theory to all texts and cultural forms, from psychology to anthropology, from ethnography to literary criticism. In his book *Mensonge romantique et vérité romanesque*, [Girard, 1976] he noted love relationships based on certain novels with this theory in mind. Imitation is an important keyword here. At the same time, a key word or event is needed for the understanding of imitation and this theory, human relations. That is Other. Being human without the Other, imitation has no essence. Man is a being who can only exist by imitating others. The world of

culture was formed on the basis of imitation of nature. People learn the forms of being human, the ways of being in the world and society, and the necessities of being human by observing others and actually copying them. He culturalizes his natural inclinations by imitating others, that is, he alienates them.

The claim that love is a pure emotion, the most natural state of a person, is also cultural. Culture is the source of knowledge and claims about human nature. Love is the feeling that has been sublimated and has become the most valuable emotional state in human relationships. People think that when they fall in love, it is only because of themselves. They are not aware that this is a result of the imitation mechanism, the mimetic desire relationship with the other. The fact that they think they can fall in love without the other is a sign of a person's alienation. Here, it would be appropriate to mention another theory that provides a new perspective on the issue of the other side. This view is a theory of the Other developed against the background of Hegel's lord-bondsman/master-slave (*Herrschaft und Knechtschaft*) dialectic. (*This concept is used in the phenomenology of spirit to mean that for a person to become aware of his self-consciousness, he must accept the self-consciousness of Other.*) [Hegel, 1977] This theory was developed by the French psychoanalyst Jacques Lacan who, about love, uses this very ambitious statement: Love means trying to give something you do not have to someone who doesn't want it from you. In Lacan's theory, it is emphasized that child first learns this during the mirror stage, which is one of the most important stages in the child's formation. (*Lacan used this concept in his article called "The Mirror Stage as Formative of the / Function as Revealed in Psychoanalytic Experience".*) [Lacan, 2006, pp.75-82] In the relationship with others, the child sees himself and is formed on the basis of this other. Mimetic desire is at work here as well.

Love used to be seen as an unfulfilled desire that caused people pain and led them to death. Because all classical and canonical texts have dealt with love in this way. In myths, legends, fairy tales and all written texts, love was an emotional state and relationship experienced with pain and torture. Along with mimetic desire, love has always been a tripartite emotion. Mimetic desire manifests itself not only in love relationships but with Girard's extension, in all human relationships. Thus, the desiring subject does not desire the object he desires just because it is him, but because the rival subject desires the object. That is to say, here the emotional state does not originate only from the desiring subject and the desired object. For this relationship to begin, there must be competition between subunits. Here the

desiring subject copies the desire of the jealous subject by desiring the desired object. This is what mimetic desire is.

It is possible to see in the texts of great writers that love constantly brings sadness, jealousy, hysterical fits, and distance leading to death. We see this clearly in texts such as Anna Karenina, The Idiot, The Brothers Karamazov, Le Lys dans la Vallée, Daisy Miller. These texts analyzed and expressed the human condition in various ways and in-depth. Ideas about man and love were produced by them. Human emotional states were analyzed by these authors in a way that did not require psychologists. It was not a problem to experience and express love in this way. Love existed together with dirt and pain.

Along with modernity, especially the globalization of capitalism, there have been great changes in this emotional state, in understanding and experiencing love. Thus, people have turned into a feeling without bitterness, where jealousy is less than fatal, sterilized, transparent, freed from third parties, without depth, or rather just a relationship. Along with the belief that so-called happiness is necessarily in the future, an idea emerged that success should be achieved after certain difficulties. It is thought that love should be the source of all this. People no longer trust places and emotional states where there is pain, separation, and dirt. Love appears as a completely smooth, ironed, no-nonsense, predictable emotion in all its aspects. People try to stay as far as possible from all relationships and images of existence that will injure them. Just as they do not want this in their own lives, they do not want to witness, read it, or watch it. They argue that this is against the nature of being human, the true nature of love. Love is always thought of as something that brings happiness to a person. Therefore, culture and power with all their mechanisms have created a transparent, unbroken and painless love. Perhaps it is because they created it, people now consider it real.

Love has been sterilized, cleansed of all viruses, and detoxified. In fact, so are all other human emotions and relationships. One does not want to realize that they are walking towards the abyss, are far from being rational, and that he is deaf to the other side. They choose to live their lives always in a straight line, often without changing their emotional states, giving account to others for all their circumstances.

Those who think that love is far from partisanship, poetry and politics are also wrong. The true nature of love is the denial of reality, and the tendency to destroy all structures. It does not conform to the ready order in any way, it works to *deconstruct* it. (*This concept belongs to Jacques Derrida. He introduced the main ideas of deconstruction in his book of Grammatology in 1967.*) [Derrida, 2016] It changes both the lover and the beloved. If he thinks

about something other than him, if he submits to the criticism of those who condemn him, if he compromises because of some rank and status, his feeling has not taken over his whole body. I understand from what I have read, love must surely kill. From what I have seen, people do not want to be injured in any way to carry a mark on their body. Therefore, they cannot fully master the destructiveness of love, rather they take refuge in the transparency and sterilization of the emotional state they call love.

Virtually everyone would want to fall in love like Karenina, but no one wants to be hurt like her and end her love with death. Everyone wants to survive all human relationships. That is why we chose to equate love with partisanship. Both works to disrupt the established order, as their convictions require. There is nothing that he notices outside of her own sense. Even the object of her desire is secondary to her. Karenina chose her son, her daughter from Vronsky for her love, and instead of being happy with Vronsky throughout her life, she chose to commit suicide where she first saw him.

After a while, love is separated from the desired object and acquires an essence of its own which can be identified not only with love but also with passion. Thus, when a person feels a mixed love for the object of his desire, it results in death. Even when love is unrequited, the person in love cannot refuse the object. He constantly revolves around himself and his lover, finding a place for herself in their relationship. Everything in his life - things that try to attract him to the order, continuity, and calmness of everyday life, for example, family, work, friends and so on - loses its meaning for him. The passion for the desired object drives him away from the things that bind him to the world and impermanence. Love here is synonymous with passion, poetry, partisanship. It is all about breaking, disintegrating, tearing apart the labyrinth, the invisible cage of everyday life. That is only possible if a person kills himself.

3. Conclusion

To recapitulate, human life is based on mimetism. Love can also exist thanks to this mimetic mechanism. However, since there is a crisis in the mimetic mechanism in the modern world, love also gets its share of this crisis. Mimetic competition is also experiencing a crisis due to the lack of a sacrifice mechanism, as people running away from blood, and things that remind them of death do not occupy vital position in human life.

Furthermore, modern human life centered on sterilization, cleansing from dirt, and purity, standardizes love. In this way, people cannot recognize themselves and their emotions and live lives one-sidedly. As a result, the connection between death and love, which is the meaning of life, is broken. Due to this rupture, social crises occur and due to the disruption of the

mimetic competition mechanism, relations between people are moving to new, groundless dimensions. Which causes unprovoked violence to spread in society and crises in the family.

All in all, it is now being considered that when ancient examples of love are displayed in literature and other forms of art, they incite people to violence. For this reason, they are criticized, and these texts are shown as the source of violence. However, gratuitous violence is due to the disruption of the mimetic competition mechanism. Hence, people do not think of relationships that hurt them, make them angry and depressed as love used to. On the contrary, they avoid it in an environment where such relationships are constantly denigrated and said to be inhumane. The advice of relationship counselors and psychologists also convinces them that love is not hurtful or lethal. That is to say, they are trying to establish a world without love.

REFERENCES

1. Ozel, I. (2004). *Reason of the Work. A Tale of Yusuf*, Shule Publications, Istanbul. (in Turkish)
2. Girard, R. (1976). *Deceit, Desire and the Novel: Self and Other in the Literature* (trans. Yvonne Freccero), Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore. (in English)
3. Hegel, G. W. F. (1977). *Phenomenology of spirit* (trans. Miller, A. V.), Oxford University Press, Oxford. (in English)
4. Lacan, J. (2006). *Ecrits* (trans. Bruce Fink). W. W. Norton & Company, New York, London. (in English)
5. Derrida, J. (2016). *Of Grammatology* (trans. Spivak G. C.). Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore. (in English)

Öldürücü bir duyğu olaraq eşq

Daşdamir Mahmandarov*

Abstrakt. Məqələdə insan davranışlarının, arzularının əslində bir başqasına aid olduğu fikri əsas götürülmüş, Aristoteldən etibarən insanın təqlid edən bir varlıq olduğu düşüncəsi şərh edilmişdir. Tədqiqatda

* Sosiologiya üzrə fəlsəfə doktoru,
Azərbaycan İlahiyyat İnstitutunun "Dinşünaslıq" kafedrasının müəllimi; Bakı, Azərbaycan
E-mail: dasdemirmehmandarov@ait.edu.az
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9604-4766>

Məqaləyə istinad: Mahmandarov, D. [2023]. Öldürücü bir duyğu olaraq eşq. "Metafizika" jurnalı, 6(4), səh.65-72.

Məqalənin tarixçəsi:

Məqalə redaksiyaya daxil olmuşdur: 11.09.2023

Təkrar işlənməyə göndərilmişdir: 09.10.2023

Çapa qəbul edilmişdir: 01.12.2023

Аристотелин “mimesis” məfhumunun daha da inkişaf etdirilmiş versiyaları ilə birlikdə insanın əslində Ötekinin arzusunu təqlid etdiyi fikri əksini tapmışdır.

Bu qənaət sadəcə fərdi yaşamda deyil, ictimai həyatın bütün sahələrində də özünü göstərir. Araşdırmada bu nəzəriyyəyə əsaslanılaraq eşq hadisəsi təhlil edilərək onun modern versiyalarının əksinə olaraq, əslində bir öldürücü duyğu olduğu iddia edilmişdir. Bu nəticənin açıqlanması məqsədilə psixozanaliz, ədəbi tənqid, fəlsəfə mətnləri və məfhumlarına aid ədəbiyyata istinad edilmişdir.

Eyni zamanda məqalədə eşq saf olmayan, kirli, acı ilə eyniləşdirilmiş bir şəkildə təqdim edilmişdir. Eşqin xoşbəxtlik gətirən deyil, isterik tutmalara, dərddə səbəb olan bir duyğu olduğu iddia edilmiş və xüsusilə Tolstoyun Anna Kareninası buna nümunə göstərilmişdir. İnsanın bu qədim duyğuya modern dünyada fərqli çalarlar verməsi, dünyanın və insan anlayışının dəyişməsi ilə paralellik təşkil edir. Modern dünyada insanlar acıdan uzaq, sterilləşdirilmiş, yaralamayan həyat yaşamağa çalışırlar. Bu da eşqin mahiyyətində dəyişikliyə səbəb olur. Məqalədə belə xüsusi vurğulanaraq eşqin qədim əsasları şərhə cəlb edilib.

Açar sözlər: eşq, mimesis, arzular, Aristotel, Tolstoy, modern dünya

Любовь как убийственное чувство

Дашдамир Махмандаров*

Абстракт. В статье привлечены к исследованию человеческие поведения и желания. Согласно изысканиям автора, они на самом деле принадлежат кому-то Иному. Начиная с Аристотеля, высказывается мнение о том, что человек является имитирующим существом. Расширяя концепцию мимесиса Аристотеля, в исследовании предоставлены версии имитированных идей человека, подражавшего желания другого.

Такие выводы проявляются не только в индивидуальной, но и во всех сферах общественной жизни. Основываясь на эту теорию в исследовании, изучено понятие любви и в отличие от современных версий, подтверждено его убийственное воздействие. Для разработки

* Доктор философии по социологии,
Преподаватель кафедры «Религиоведение» Азербайджанского института теологии; Баку Азербайджан
E-mail: dasdemirmehmandarov@ait.edu.az
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9604-4766>

Цитировать статью: Махмандаров, Д. [2023]. Любовь как убийственное чувство. *Журнал «Metafizika»*, 6(4), с.65-72.

История статьи:

Статья поступила в редакцию: 11.09.2023

Отправлена на доработку: 09.10.2023

Принята для печати: 01.12.2023

данной проблемы использована литература о психоанализе, а также привлечены к разработке философские тексты, понятия и литературная критика.

Наряду с этим в статье любовь отождествляется с несвятостью, неочищенностью и горечью. В заключении отражены выводы об эмоциональных особенностях любви, которая не приносит счастья, способствует истерическим припадкам, беде и в пример приводится Анна Коренина Толстого. Человек, придавая отличительные оттенки этому древнейшему чувству, создает параллели в связи с изменениями понятий о мире и человеке. В современном мире люди стараются воздерживаться от боли и прожить стерильно и безболезненно. И это способствует изменениям в сущности любви. В статье отмечены такие особенности любви и изучены ее древние основы.

Ключевые слова: любовь, мимесис, мечты, Аристотель, Толстой, современный мир